UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,679	12/14/2000	John E. Schier	062891.0434	2124

7590 06/07/2004

Barton E. Showalter
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER	
NORRIS, TREMAYNE M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,679	SCHIER, JOHN E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tremayne M. Norris	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-9,11,15-19,21,24,25,28,30,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Landwehr et al (US pat 5,892,901).

Regarding claim 1, Landwehr teaches a method for providing a secure operating environment for a network accessible system comprising:

accessing a delay timer operably coupled to a communication module, the delay timer including a delay time interval (col.5 lines 29-34);

comparing the delay time interval to an activity associated with the system communicating with the network (col.3 lines 45-65); and

isolating the communication module from the network based on the comparison (col.3 lines 4-6; col.3 lines 26-28).

Regarding claim 2, Landwehr teaches disabling the communication module if the communication module remains idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval (col.3 lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 3, Landwehr teaches the disabling includes reducing a power state associated with the communication module (col.2 line 65 thru col.3 line 6).

Regarding claim 4, Landwehr teaches detecting a user initiated request to access the network;

altering the power state of the communication module;

initializing the communication module to communicate with the network; and

initializing the delay timer (col.3 lines 25-65).

Regarding claim 5, Landwehr teaches the disabling further comprises removing power supplied to the communication module (col.2 line 65 thru col.3 line 6).

Regarding claim 6, Landwehr teaches the isolating further comprises disconnecting a communication port associated with the communication module (col.4 lines 30-34).

Regarding claim 7, Landwehr teaches initializing the delay timer in response to the system initiating communication with the network (col.3 lines 32-38).

Regarding claim 8, Landwehr teaches adjusting the delay time interval using a software interface associated with the delay timer (col.4 lines 49-57).

Regarding claim 9, Landwehr teaches adjusting the delay time interval using a hardware interface associated with the delay timer (col.4 lines 49-57).

Regarding claim 11, Landwehr teaches accessing a network location;

disabling the communication module upon the communication module being idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval; and

enabling the communication module upon determining a request to access the network location (col.3 lines 25-65).

Claims 15-18 are substantially equivalent to claims 1-4 respectively, therefore claims 15-18 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Claims 19 and 21 are substantially equivalent to claims 1 and 11 respectively, therefore claims 19 and 21 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Regarding claim 24, Landwehr teaches a communication module operable to communicate information via the network (col.2 line 65 thru col.3 line 6);

a delay timer operably coupled to the communication module (col.5 lines 29-34); and

the delay timer including a delay time interval operable to enable communication between the communication module and the network (col.5 lines 29-34).

Regarding claim 25, Landwehr teaches a data bus coupled to the communication module and a processor;

and the data bus operable to communicate information based on the delay time interval (col.2 line 61 thru col.3 line 7; col.3 lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 28, Landwehr teaches the delay time interval programmed via an interface associated with the delay timer (col.5 lines 29-34).

Regarding claim 30, Landwehr teaches a power state operably associated with the delay timer and the power state operable to provide power to the communication module (col.3 lines 22-25).

Regarding claim 31, Landwehr teaches a communication port communicatively coupling the communication module and the network; and the communication port operable based on the delay time interval (col.4 lines 30-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10,20,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landwehr, and further in view of Namma et al (US pat 6,185,616).

Regarding claim 10, Landwehr teaches the method of claim 1, but does not teach locating a reference within a memory associated with the delay timer, the reference operably associated with enabling the communication module; and removing the reference in response to the communication module being idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval.

Namma does teach locating a reference within a memory associated with the delay timer, the reference operably associated with enabling the communication module (col.6 lines 17-48); and removing the reference in response to the communication module being idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval (col.6 lines 40-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Landwehr's secure identification system with Namma's teaching of removing data associated with communication connection in order to provide an improved method of disconnecting communication between clients and servers (Namma col.1 lines 52-54; col.6 lines 1-9).

Claim 20 is substantially equivalent to claim 10, therefore claim 20 is rejected because of similar rationale.

Regarding claim 27, Namma teaches a communication module reference operable to be stored within memory (col.6 lines 18-22).

5. Claims 12-14,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landwehr, and further in view of Namma et al and Virtanen (US pat 6,249,681).

Regarding claim 12, Landwehr teaches disabling the communication module upon the communication module remaining idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval (col.3 lines 59-65), but does not teach storing a network reference operable to identify the network location; removing a communication module reference from a memory stack associated with the communication module, the communication module reference associated with enabling the communication module; and copying the communication module reference to the memory stack upon detecting a request by the system to access the network location.

Namma teaches storing a network reference operable to identify the network location; removing a communication module reference from a memory stack associated with the communication module, the communication module reference associated with enabling the communication module (col.6 lines 17-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Landwehr's secure identification system with Namma's teaching of removing data associated with communication connection in order

to provide an improved method of disconnecting communication between clients and servers (Namma col.1 lines 52-54; col.6 lines 1-9).

Virtanen teaches storing a network reference operable to identify the network location (col.4 lines 21-43), disabling the communication module upon the communication module remaining idle for a time period greater than the delay time interval (col.2 lines 42-51), and copying the communication module reference to the memory stack upon detecting a request by the system to access the network location (col.5 lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Landwehr's secure identification system with Virtanen's teaching of re-establishing communication in order to provide an improved and more efficient method that re-establishes communication between to parties after communication has been disconnected, interrupted, or disabled (col.3 lines 23-33; col.3 lines 40-58).

Regarding claim 13, Landwehr, Namma, and Virtanen teach the method of claim 12, in addition Virtanen teaches enabling the communication module; and accessing the network location using the network reference (col.5 lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 14, Landwehr, Namma, and Virtanen teach the method of claim 12, in addition Landwehr teaches initializing the delay timer upon detecting a user initiated request to access the network (col.3 lines 32-37).

Claims 22 and 23 are substantially equivalent to claims 12 and 13 respectively, therefore claims 22 and 23 are rejected because of similar rationale.

6. Claim 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landwehr, and further in view of Virtanen.

Regarding claim 26, Landwehr teaches the device of claim 24, but does not teach a memory operable to store the delay timer interval. Virtanen teaches a memory operable to store the delay timer interval (col.6 lines 38-40; col.8 lines 54-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Landwehr's secure identification system with Virtanen's teaching of re-establishing communication in order to provide an improved and more efficient method that re-establishes communication between to parties after communication has been disconnected, interrupted, or disabled (col.3 lines 23-33; col.3 lines 40-58).

7. Claim 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landwehr, and further in view of Yoshida (US pat 5,495,480).

Regarding claim 29, Landwehr teaches the device of claim 28 but does not teach the delay time interval programmed using a delay time interval reference and a communication module reference. Yoshida teaches the delay time interval programmed using a delay time interval reference and a communication module reference (col.1 lines

34-35; col.2 lines 21-41; col.3 lines 20-27; col.5 lines 10-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Landwehr's secure identification system with Yoshida's teachings of a disconnecting timer circuit in order to provide a time dependent disconnecting circuit that is able to accommodate higher level applications (Yoshida col.1 lines 35-60).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tremayne M. Norris whose telephone number is (703) 305-8045. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 305-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tremayne Norris

May 28, 2004

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137